

Remarks

Claims 10-32 are pending in this application. By the foregoing amendment, Applicants seek to cancel claims 1-3 without prejudice or disclaimer, and add new claims 10-32. These changes are believed to be fully supported by the specification and are not believed to introduce new matter. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the amendments and additions be entered by the Examiner. Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections, and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103

At paragraphs 4-5, claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,101,371 to Ash. Also, claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Ash in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,101, 371 to Barber. Claims 1-3 have been canceled in favor of new claims 10-32, rendering these rejections moot. Applicants assert that new independent claims 10, 19, and 25 and their respective dependent claims are patentable over the cited art for reasons mentioned below.

New claim 10 recites a receiver having a combination of a first mixer and a second mixer that are disposed on a common substrate, and a *differential filter* that is coupled to the output of the first mixer. Neither Ash or Barber recite this particular combination, namely the differential filter. Furthermore, the combination of Ash and Barber also does not recite the features in new claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants assert that claim 10 and its respective dependent claims are patentable over the cited art. Furthermore, independent claims 19 and 25 also recite the differential filter and other differential features, and are patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Furthermore, the dependent claims recite additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited art. For example, claim 15 recites that the second mixer provides image rejection, which is not taught or suggested by either Ash or Barber. Claim 16 further defines the second mixer to be a differential I/Q mixer that provides image rejection. This combination is not taught or suggested by the cited art.

Regarding the official notice of differential circuits, Applicants assert that the specific combination recited in the pending claims is not notoriously well known. Namely, it is not well known to configure a receiver circuit having first and second mixers disposed on a common substrate, and to connect them together with a *differential filter* as recited in Applicants new claims. Furthermore, it is noted that the cited art does not disclose this specific combination as discussed above.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants assert that independent claims 10 , 19, and 25 and their respective dependant claims are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants request that these claims be passed to allowance.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jeffrey T. Helvey
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,757

Date: 7/15/02

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

Version with markings to show changes made

In the Claims:

Please cancel claims 1-3, and add new claims 10-32.